

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/758,830	01/11/2001	Jeffrey A. Zimmerman	P-5231CIP	8534	
75	90 08/13/2003				
David J. Richter Piper Marbury Rudnick & Wolfe P.O. Box 64807			EXAMINER		
			CINTINS, IVARS C		
Chicago, IL 60664-0807			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1724	11	
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.		Applicant(s)	A
Office Action Summary		09/758,830		ZIMMERMAN ET AL.	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		Ivars C. Cintins		1724	
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication r Reply	appears on the cover	sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION mosions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, howe a reply within the statutory mini rirod will apply and will expire S atute, cause the application to	wer, may a reply be tim mum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timel he mailing date of this co	y. ommunication.
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>15 May 2003</u> .			
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-fir	nal.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un	owance except for for der <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> ,	rmal matters, pro	osecution as to th 53 O.G. 213.	e merits is
·	ion of Claims				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the applica				
. —	4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-23 is/are without	drawn from considera	tion.		
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
	Claim(s) 1-12 and 24-33 is/are rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar ion Papers	nd/or election requiren	nent.		
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) \square a	ccepted or b) objecte	ed to by the Exan	niner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection t			, ,	
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)∏ approve	d b)⊡ disappro	ved by the Examine	er.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in	· •	on.		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).	
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been recei	ved.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been recei	ved in Applicatio	n No	
* S	3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Gee the attached detailed Office action for a	Bureau (PCT Rule 17	7.2(a)).		Stage
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	·			application)
а) The translation of the foreign language Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	provisional applicatio	n has been rece	eived.	1- F 2
Attachmen	•	, , ,	=- 33 · = 0		
2) D Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(5) 🔲 1		(PTO-413) Paper No(atent Application (PTC	
S. Patent and Tr TO-326 (Re		Action Summary		Part of Paper No. 11	

Application/Control Number: 09/758,830

Art Unit: 1724

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 and 24-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,722,797), Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 5,232,953), or Janke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,234,601) in view of the Chemical Engineers' Handbook (hereinafter "Perry's Handbook"). As pointed out in the previous Office Action, each of the primary references discloses that it is known to regenerate a water softener with either sodium chloride or potassium chloride brine (see col. 1, lines 19-23 of Gauer et al.; col. 3, lines 3-5 of Johnson; and col. 1, line 41 of Janke et al.). Accordingly, each of these primary references discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the recited water quantity and temperature determinations and calculations. Perry's Handbook discloses (see pages 3-6, 3-19 and 3-21) that sodium chloride and potassium chloride have different solubilities in water at different temperatures. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to calculate the amount of water necessary to form the brine regenerant in each of the primary reference systems, based upon the particular regenerant salt selected and the temperature of the water employed, in order to optimize regenerant salt usage in each of these primary reference systems. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the relationships recited in claims 27-33 in forming the brine regenerant solution of each modified primary reference system, in order to ensure that this regenerant solution is capable of regenerating the water softeners disclosed therein.

Art Unit: 1724

Applicant's arguments filed May 15, 2003 have been noted and carefully considered, but no longer appear to be relevant in view of the new grounds of rejection. Applicant should note, however, that Perry's Handbook clearly teaches that sodium chloride and potassium chloride have different solubilities in water at different temperatures; and given this teaching, one of ordinary skill in the water softening art would have been motivated to modify any of the primary references in the manner proposed above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is (703) 308-3840. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Blaine Copenheaver, can be reached at (703) 308-1261.

The fax phone numbers for this art unit are: (703) 872-9311 for "Official" faxes after Final Rejection; (703) 872-9310 for all other "Official" faxes; and (703) 872-9492 for "Draft" and other "Unofficial" faxes.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Ivars C. Cintins
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1724

I. Cintins August 10, 2003